UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,784	01/13/2004	Nicolas Steven Huslak	030409 (9400-63)	2875

39072 7590 06/25/2009

AT&T Legal Department - MB
Attn: Patent Docketing
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

EXAMINER	
HASHEM, LISA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2614	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/25/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/756,784	HUSLAK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LISA HASHEM	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 May 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. Appl. Publ. 2005/0010638 by Richardson et al, hereinafter Richardson in view of DSL Evolution-Architecture Requirements for the Support of QoS Enabled IP Services, Revision 8, hereinafter DSL Evolution (Applicant submitted in IDS filed on 6-7-2004) and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,611,038 by Shaw et al, hereinafter Shaw.

Regarding claim 1, Richardson discloses a videoconferencing method using Quality of Service (QoS) and/or bandwidth allocation in a Regional/Access Network (RAN) (Fig. 3; Fig. 8A) (section 0056-0057; 0060) that provides end-to-end transport between an Application Service Provider (ASP) (Fig. 8A, 205; videoconference server) and Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) (Fig. 8A: 802, 806) (section 0094-0103), the method comprising:

receiving, by the ASP (i.e. videoconference server), a request for a videoconference designating a plurality of participants (i.e. unicast session when two participants are involved or multicast session when more than two participants are involved) from one of the plurality of participants

(section 0095; 0200-0201; 0206; 0209); requesting, by the ASP (i.e. videoconference server), a desired QoS and/or bandwidth allocation for the videoconference for the plurality of participants from the RAN using at least one call (i.e. policy server including policy information for a requested videoconference session) responsive to the received request for a videoconference (section 0067-0068; 0103; 0138; 0201; 0205-0206); and activating the videoconference for the plurality of participants using the desired QoS and/or bandwidth allocation (section 0103; 0201; 0205-0206).

Richardson does not disclose an Application Programming Interface (API) call responsive to the received request for a videoconference.

DSL Evolution discloses a method using Quality of Service (QoS) and/or bandwidth allocation (Section 4.2.2.2, page 12) in a Regional/Access Network (RAN) (Section 4.2.5, Fig. 11: Regional/Access Network, page 17; Fig. 20: Access Network, page 30) that provides end-to-end transport between an Application Service Provider (ASP) (Fig. 2: ASP Network, Section 3.2, page 7) and Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) (Section 4.2.5, page 17; Fig. 20: CPE, page 30), the method comprising:

receiving, by the ASP, a request for a videoconference (Section 2.1-2.2, pages 2-4; Section 3.2: The Application Service Provider (ASP), page 7; Section 5.1, page 26; Section 5.3.1: Phase 1, page 30; Section C.1.1: CPE, page 45); requesting, by the ASP, a desired QoS and/or bandwidth allocation for the videoconference for participants (i.e. users) from the RAN using at least one Application Programming Interface (API) call responsive to the received request for a videoconference (Section 3.2: The Application Service Provider (ASP), page 7; Section 3.3.1, page 8; Section 4.2.2.1-4.2.2.2, pages 11-12; Section 7.2, page 35); and activating the

videoconference for the participants using the desired QoS and/or bandwidth allocation (Section 4.2.2.2, page 12), wherein the API includes an Application-to-Network Interface (ANI) (Fig. 2: ANI, page 7; Section 4.2.2.1-4.2.2.2, Fig. 5: A10-ASP, pages 11-12) that is defined between the RAN and the ASP (Fig. 2, page 7; Fig. 5, page 11).

Again, Richardson discloses the claimed method except Richardson uses at least one call responsive to the received request for a videoconference rather than one API call. However, the claimed feature of an API call responsive to the received request for a videoconference was old and well known in the art. DSL Evolution clearly teaches such concept.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Richardson to include an API call responsive to the received request for a videoconference as taught by DSL Evolution. In other words, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been lead to make such a modification of Richardson to include an API call responsive to the received request for a videoconference, such as the API call of DSL Evolution, to the RAN of Richardson so the RAN of Richardson can utilize an interface to set up a videoconference session between the ASP and the RAN and allocate QoS and/or bandwidth allocation for the session.

Richardson in view of DSL Evolution do not disclose requesting capabilities associated with at least one of the participants from the RAN; selecting a desired QoS and/or bandwidth allocation based on the capabilities.

Shaw discloses a videoconferencing method comprising: requesting capabilities associated with at least one of the participants from the RAN (col. 14, lines 12-16); selecting a

desired QoS and/or bandwidth allocation based on the capabilities (col. 13, lines 34 – col. 14, line 51)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Richardson in view of DSL Evolution to include requesting capabilities associated with at least one of the participants from the RAN; selecting a desired QoS and/or bandwidth allocation based on the capabilities as taught by Shaw. In other words, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been lead to make such a modification of Richardson in view of DSL Evolution to include requesting capabilities associated with at least one of the participants from the RAN; selecting a desired QoS and/or bandwidth allocation based on the capabilities, such as the requesting capabilities associated with at least one of the participants from the RAN; selecting a desired QoS and/or bandwidth allocation based on the capabilities of Shaw, to the method of Richardson in view of DSL Evolution in order to set up desired QoS and/or bandwidth before a videoconference begins.

Regarding claim 2, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 2.2, page 4; Section 4.2.2.2, page 12; Section 7.1, page 35).

Regarding claim 3, please see (Richardson: section 0157, 0195-0199; DSL Evolution: Section: 4.2.1.2, page 11; Section 7.2, page 35).

Regarding claim 4, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206, 0211-0212; DSL Evolution: Section 2.2., pages 2-4; Section 5.1-5.1.1, pages 26-27).

Regarding claim 5, please see (Richardson: section 0059, 0081-0082; DSL Evolution: Section: 4.2.7.2, page 24).

Regarding claim 6, please see (Richardson: section 0055, 0065, 0069).

Regarding claim 7, please see (Richardson: section 0205).

Regarding claim 8, please see (Richardson: Fig. 2, 210; section 0056, 0068; DSL Evolution: Section 3.1, page 4; Fig. 12: BRAS, page 18; Section 4.2.5.2, pages 18-19).

Regarding claim 9, please see (Richardson: section 0117-0121; DSL Evolution: Section: 4.2.7.2, page 24).

Regarding claim 10, please see (Richardson: section 0063, 0065, 0138, 0164-0166, 0186, 0207; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.5.2, page 18).

Regarding claim 11, please see (Richardson: section 0138, 0154, 0158, 0163-0166, 0186).

Regarding claim 12, please see (Richardson: section 0138, 0154, 0158, 0163-0165, 0187, 0186).

Regarding claim 13, please see (Richardson: section 0153, 0164-0166, 0186, 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 5.3.1-5.3.2.3, pages 28-34).

Regarding claim 14, please see (Richardson: section 0101-0103, DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.1.1-4.2.1.2, pages 10-11; Section 4.2.5.1, page 17).

Regarding claim 15, please see (Richardson: section 0094-0099, 0201; DSL Evolution: Section 2.1-2.2, pages 2-4; Section 3.2, page 7; Section 5.1, page 26; Section C.1.1: CPE, page 45).

Regarding claim 16, please see (Richardson: section 0164-0166, 0186, 0205-0206, 0211-0212; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.5.2, page 18).

Regarding claim 17, please see (Richardson: section 0056, 0067, 0092, 0164-0166, 0186, CPN: Fig. 2, 225, RG: Fig. 2, 240, Fig. 1c, 138; DSL Evolution: Section 2.2., pages 2-4; Section

3.3.4, page 8; Fig. 14, page 21; Section 4.2.7, pages 22-23; Section 4.2.7.2, pages 23-24; Section 5.1-5.1.1, pages 26-27).

Regarding claim 18, please see (Richardson: section 0142-0147; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.1.1-4.2.2.2, pages 10-12).

Regarding claim 19, please see (Richardson: section 0153, 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 5.3.1-5.3.2.3, pages 28-34).

Regarding claim 20, please see (Richardson: section 0164-0166, 0186, 0205-0206, 0211-0212).

Regarding claim 21, please see (Richardson: section 0054, 0158, 0164-0166, 0186; DSL Evolution: Appendix B, pages 40-43).

Regarding claim 22, please see (Richardson: section 0164-0166, 0178, 0186, 0205-0206, 0211-0212).

Regarding claim 23, please see (Richardson: section 0184-0186).

Regarding claim 24, please see (Richardson: Fig. 1c, 136, section 0092; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.7.1-4.2.7.2, pages 23-24).

Regarding claim 25, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.5.2, page 18; Section 5.3.2, page 31).

Regarding claim 26, please see (Richardson: section 0164-0166, 0186, 0205-0206).

Regarding claim 27, please see (Richardson: section 0060; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.7.1-4.2.7.2, pages 23-24).

Regarding claim 28, please see (Richardson: section 0164-0166, 0186; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.7.2, page 24).

Regarding claim 29, please see (Richardson: section 0060, 0101-0102, 0164-0166, 0186, 0205; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.7.2, page 24).

Regarding claim 30, please see (Richardson: section 0101-0102, 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.5-4.2.5.1, pages 17-18).

Regarding claim 31, please see (Richardson: section 0065, 0101-0102, 0205-0206).

Regarding claim 32, please see (Richardson: section 0094-0099, 0201, 0205).

4. Claims 33-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. Appl. Publ. 2005/0010638 by Richardson et al, hereinafter Richardson in view of DSL Evolution-Architecture Requirements for the Support of QoS Enabled IP Services, Revision 8, hereinafter DSL Evolution (Applicant submitted in IDS filed on 6-7-2004).

Regarding claim 33, Richardson discloses a videoconferencing method using Quality of Service (QoS)and/or bandwidth allocation in a Regional/Access Network (RAN) (Fig. 3; Fig. 8A) (section 0056-0057; 0060) that provides end-to-end
transport between an Application Service Provider (ASP) (Fig. 8A, 205; videoconference server) and a Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) (Fig. 8A: 802, 806) (section 0094-0103), the method comprising:
receiving, from the ASP (i.e. videoconference server), at the RAN a modify QoS and/or bandwidth allocation message for a videoconference for a plurality of participants (i.e. unicast session when two participants are involved or multicast session when more than two participants are involved) (section 0099-0103; 0142-0147; 0164-0166; 0200-0201; 0205-0206);
identifying, by the RAN, the participants and at least one CPE associated with the participants (section 0200-0201; 0205-0206; 0209);

establishing, by the RAN, a control signal application flow, a video application flow, and an audio application flow for each of the identified participants (section 0067-0068; 0142-0147; 0153; 0205-0206);

updating the RAN with QoS and/or bandwidth information for the established application flows based on the received modify QoS and/or bandwidth allocation message (section 0067-0068; 0134; 0142-0147; 0164-0166; 0205-0206); and

sending the QoS and/or bandwidth information for the established application flows to the identified at least one CPE (section 0142-0147; 0164-0166; 0205-0206).

Richardson does not disclose the RAN includes a regional broadband network, a broadband remote access server and an access network.

DSL Evolution discloses a method using Quality of Service (QoS)and/or bandwidth allocation (Section 4.2.2.2, page 12) in a Regional/Access Network (RAN) (Section 4.2.5, Fig. 11: Regional/Access Network, page 17; Fig. 20: Access Network, page 30) that provides end-to-end transport between an Application Service Provider (ASP) (Fig. 2: ASP Network, Section 3.2, page 7) and Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) (Section 4.2.5, page 17; Fig. 20: CPE, page 30), the method comprising:

receiving, from the ASP, at the RAN a modify QoS and/or bandwidth allocation message for a videoconference for participants (i.e. users) (Section 2.2., pages 2-4; Section 5.1-5.1.1, pages 26-27);

identifying, by the RAN, the participants and at least one CPE associated with the participants (Section 3.2: The Application Service Provider (ASP), pages 7-8; Section 4.2.7, pages 22-23; Section 7.1-7.2, page 35);

establishing, by the RAN, a control signal application flow, a video application flow, and an audio application flow for each of the identified participants (Section 5.3.1-5.3.2.3, pages 28-34); updating the RAN with QoS and/or bandwidth information for the established application flows based on the received modify QoS and/or bandwidth allocation message (Section 2.2., pages 2-4; Section 5.1-5.1.1, pages 26-27); and sending the QoS and/or bandwidth information for the established application flows to the identified at least one CPE (Section 3.2: The Application Service Provider (ASP), pages 7-8; Section 4.2.7, pages 22-23; Section 5.3.1-5.3.2.3, pages 28-34; Section 7.1-7.2, page 35), wherein the RAN includes a regional broadband network, a broadband remote access server and an access network (Section 3.1, page 4; Section 4.2.5-4.2.5.3, pages 17-19; Fig. 12: Regional Broadband Network, BRAS, Access Network, page 18).

Again, Richardson discloses the claimed method except Richardson discloses a RAN rather than the RAN includes a regional broadband network, a broadband remote access server and an access network. However, the claimed feature of the RAN includes a regional broadband network, a broadband remote access server and an access network was old and well known in the art. DSL Evolution clearly teaches such concept.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Richardson to include the RAN includes a regional broadband network, a broadband remote access server and an access network as taught by DSL Evolution. In other words, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been lead to make such a modification of Richardson to include the RAN includes a regional broadband network, a broadband remote access server and an access network, such as the RAN of DSL Evolution,

to the RAN of Richardson so the RAN of Richardson can support multiple videoconference sessions for participants and allocate QoS and/or bandwidth allocation for the session.

Regarding claim 34, please see (Richardson: section 0067-0068, 0103, 0138, 0201, 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 3.2: The Application Service Provider (ASP), page 7; Section 3.3.1, page 8; Section 4.2.2.1-4.2.2.2, pages 11-12; Section 7.2, page 35).

Regarding claim 35, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 2.2, page 4; Section 4.2.2.2, page 12; Section 7.1, page 35).

Regarding claim 36, please see (Richardson: section 0157, 0195-0199; DSL Evolution: Section: 4.2.1.2, page 11; Section 7.2, page 35).

Regarding claim 37, please see (Richardson: section 0142-0147; DSL Evolution: Section 4.2.1.1-4.2.2.2, pages 10-12).

Regarding claim 38, please see (Richardson: section 0153, 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 5.3.1-5.3.2.3, pages 28-34).

Regarding claim 39, please see (Richardson: section 0056, 0067, 0092, 0164-0166, 0186, 0205-0206, 0211-0212, CPN: Fig. 2, 225, RG: Fig. 2, 240, Fig. 1c, 138; DSL Evolution: Section 2.2., pages 2-4; Section 3.3.4, page 8; Fig. 14, page 21; Section 4.2.7, pages 22-23; Section 4.2.7.2, pages 23-24; Section 5.1-5.1.1, pages 26-27).

Regarding claim 40, please see (Richardson: section 0054, 0158, 0164-0166, 0186; DSL Evolution: Appendix B, pages 40-43).

Regarding claim 41, please see the rejection to claim 1 above to reject the videoconferencing system in claim 41; (Richardson: authentication -> see membership of each participant and public/private call: section 0063; 0065).

Regarding claim 42, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206, 0211-0212; DSL Evolution: Section 2.2., pages 2-4; Section 5.1-5.1.1, pages 26-27).

Regarding claim 43, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 2.2, page 4; Section 4.2.2.2, page 12; Section 7.1, page 35).

Regarding claim 44, please see (Richardson: section 0157, 0195-0199; DSL Evolution: Section: 4.2.1.2, page 11; Section 7.2, page 35).

Regarding claim 45, please see (Richardson: MCU: videoconference session controller; section 0205-0206).

Regarding claim 46, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206).

Regarding claim 47, please see the rejection to claim 33 above to reject the videoconferencing system in claim 47.

Regarding claim 48, please see (Richardson: section 0067-0068, 0103, 0138, 0201, 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 3.2: The Application Service Provider (ASP), page 7; Section 3.3.1, page 8; Section 4.2.2.1-4.2.2.2, pages 11-12; Section 7.2, page 35).

Regarding claim 49, please see (Richardson: section 0205-0206; DSL Evolution: Section 2.2, page 4; Section 4.2.2.2, page 12; Section 7.1, page 35).

Regarding claim 50, please see (Richardson: section 0157, 0195-0199; DSL Evolution: Section: 4.2.1.2, page 11; Section 7.2, page 35).

Regarding claim 51, please see (Richardson: section 0067-0068; 0164-0166, 0186, 0205-0206, 0211-0212).

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-51 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-55 of copending Application No. 10/756790 and claims 1-44 of copending Application No. 10/716051 (Notice of Allowability filed on 11-14-2008). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications pertain to the same subject matter as the instant application including: '…requesting or modifying a desired Quality of Service (QoS) and/or bandwidth allocation in a Regional/Access Network (RAN) that provides end-to-end

transport between an Application Service Provider (ASP) and Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) …'.

However, the claims in the '790 application and '051 application do not disclose a videoconference using QoS and/or bandwidth allocation in a RAN.

Examiner takes **official notice** that the limitation '…a videoconference using QoS and/or bandwidth allocation in a RAN…'is well known in the art and can be combined with the pending claims to read on the claims of the instant application.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the copending applications to provide a videoconference using QoS and/or bandwidth allocation in a RAN.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892 Form.

8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or call:

(571) 272-2600 (for customer service assistance)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LISA HASHEM whose telephone number is (571)272-7542. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Lisa Hashem/
Examiner, Art Unit 2614
June 22, 2009